



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/098,513	03/18/2002	Anders Krantz	3682-23	4403
23117 7590 10/02/2007 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203			EXAMINER AILES, BENJAMIN A	
			ART UNIT 2142	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/098,513

Applicant(s)

KRANTZ ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin A. Ailes

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to correspondence filed 19 July 2007.
2. Claims 1-16 and 18-22 remain pending. Claim 17 has been canceled without prejudice.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-4, 9, 10, 15, 16 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Siefert (US 6,334,779).
5. Regarding claim 1, Siefert discloses a control system for achieving quality ensured competence development, wherein said system is connected to a distributed computer network, wherein said system comprises:

at least one first memory device connected to said distributed computer network and operable to store all course sections of different courses and an ideal time for each course section (Fig. 1, repositories, col. 5, ll. 20-24 and col. 8, ll. 47-51, resources for courses are stored within repositories),

at least one second memory device, at least logically separate from the first memory device, connected to said distributed computer network and operable to store

Art Unit: 2142

all studied material affiliated with said course section (col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 3, user accesses materials, or resources, within repositories),

at least one third memory device, at least logically separate from the first memory device and second memory device, connected to said distributed computer network and operable to store individual-adapted course plans (col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 10, learning profile),

at least one control device connected to said distributed computer network and operable in calculating and indicating a planned completion date for each individual course plan with the aid of said ideal time for different course sections and the time spent by said individual on different course sections (col. 4, ll. 38-46 and col. 9, ll. 45-50, use of an intelligent administrator), and

at least one fourth memory device connected to said distributed computer network and operable to store the course plans and course sections that have been completed with respect to each individual (Fig. 1, repositories, col. 5, ll. 20-24 and col. 8, ll. 47-51, resources for courses are stored within repositories, col. 3, ll. 34-39, student progress is tracked).

6. Regarding claim 2, Siefert discloses the control system for achieving quality ensured competence development wherein each individual obtains access to said control system by means of a computer device connectable to said distributed computer network, and in that the control system also includes at least one recording device operable in recording the time spent for each course section by each individual (col. 4,

line 65 – col. 5, line 4, use of personal computers, col. 9, ll. 37-44, measure rate of learning).

7. Regarding claim 3, Siefert discloses the control system for achieving quality ensured competence development wherein the distributed computer network is the Internet or a Wide Area Network (WAN) (Figure 1 and col. 2, ll. 15-16 and 44-47).

8. Regarding claim 4, Siefert discloses the control system for achieving quality ensured competence development wherein said at least one first memory device, said at least one third memory device and said at least one fourth memory device are comprised of at least one first server device; and in that said at least one second memory device is comprise of a second server device (Fig. 1 and col. 4, line 55 – col. 5, line 7).

9. Regarding claim 9, Siefert discloses the control system for achieving quality ensured competence development wherein access to the control system is obtained through the medium of a password or security codes (col. 6, ll. 34-39).

10. Regarding claim 10, Siefert discloses a method of achieving quality ensured competence development with the aid of a control system for achieving quality ensured competence development, wherein the method comprising:

choosing from a first memory device included in the control system and operable in storing all course sections for different courses and an ideal time for each course section of the courses, wherein the course sections for an individual adapted course plan, and storing said course plan in a third memory device, at least logically separate from the first memory device, included in the control system (Fig. 1, repositories, col. 5,

ll. 20-24 and col. 8, ll. 47-51, resources for courses are stored within repositories, col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 10, learning profile);

downloading study material affiliated with said chosen course sections in the course plan, wherein the course sections are downloaded from a second memory device, at least logically separate from the first and third memory devices, included in the control system and operable in storing all study material (col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 3, user accesses materials, or resources, within repositories);

tracking time spent by said individual on each of the different course sections in the course plan (col. 9, ll. 37-44, measure rate of learning),

calculating and indicating a planned completion date for said course plan by means of a control device included in the control system and with the aid of said ideal time for different course sections and also with the aid of the time spent by said individual on different course sections (col. 4, ll. 38-46 and col. 9, ll. 45-50, use of an intelligent administrator); and

when one or more course sections or the course plan has/have or has been completed, storing said course section/sections and/or course plan in a fourth memory device, at least logically separate from the first, second and third memory devices, included in the control system(Fig. 1, repositories, col. 5, ll. 20-24 and col. 8, ll. 47-51, resources for courses are stored within repositories, col. 3, ll. 34-39, student progress is tracked).

11. Regarding claim 15, Siefert discloses the method of achieving quality ensured competence development, further comprising, when study material has been revised in

the second memory device, the revised study material is distributed to those individuals who have chosen the course section affiliated with said study material (col. 6, ll. 32-39).

12. Regarding claim 16, Siefert discloses the method of achieving quality ensured competence development wherein access to the control system is obtained by entering a password or security codes (col. 6, ll. 34-39).

13. Regarding claim 18, Siefert discloses a method for selecting, taking and validating a individually adapted course plan using a networked computer system including a user computer device in communication with a control system, wherein the control system includes a first memory device storing course sections for different courses and an ideal time for each course section, a second memory device storing study material for each course section, a third memory device storing individually adapted course plans and a fourth memory device storing completed course sections and course plans, wherein the first, second, third and fourth memory devices are at least logically separate from each other, and the method comprises:

through the user computer device, a user accesses the control system and the first memory device to choose a plurality of course selections to create an individual adapted course plan for the user to achieve a predetermined level of competence wherein the course plan is adapted based on an individual competence of the user before taking the course selections (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 4, col. 4, ll. 21-26, col. 7, line 66 – col. 8, line 4 and col. 8, ll. 47-51);

storing the individual adapted course plan in the third memory device (Fig. 1, repositories, col. 5, ll. 20-24 and col. 8, ll. 47-51, resources for courses are stored within repositories, col. 3, ll. 34-39, student progress is tracked);

through the user computer device, the user downloads study material for each chosen course section from the second memory device in the control system (col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 3, user accesses materials, or resources, within repositories);

recording a progress of the user in taking and completing each of the course sections (col. 8, ll. 5-9);

calculating a planned completion date for the individual adapted course plan using the ideal time for the chosen course sections and the recorded progress of the user (col. 4, ll. 38-46 and col. 9, ll. 45-50, use of an intelligent administrator);

after completing each course section, the user takes a test using the user computer device and the test is graded, wherein an indication of the completed course section is stored in the fourth memory device (col. 9, ll. 1-10), and

after completing a course plan, an indication that the user completed the course plan is stored in the fourth memory device (col. 9, ll. 1-10).

14. Regarding claim 19, Siefert discloses the method further comprising validating a user before the user takes course sections wherein the validation comprises:

validating a user to determine the individual competence of the user based on a consultation with a user and a supervisor (col. 9, ll. 45-49); and

wherein the choosing of course selections is determined, at least in part, based on the individual competence of the user (col. 8, ll. 13-21).

15. Regarding claim 20, Siefert discloses the method wherein the test is generated from a randomized list of test items (col. 9, ll. 1-10).
16. Regarding claim 21, Siefert discloses the method wherein the test comprises test questions regarding theoretical questions and test items of practical events related to the course section (col. 9, ll. 37-44).
17. Regarding claim 22, Siefert discloses the method wherein the test items of practical events are presented to the user in a chronological order in accordance with a production process or station system corresponding to the practical events (col. 9, ll. 37-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2142

20. Claims 5-8 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siefert in view of Holtz et al. (US 6,909,874 B2), hereinafter referred to as Holtz.

21. Regarding claim 5, Siefert teaches individuals utilizing computer devices (PCs) (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 4) and the status tracking of individual users with respect to course section progress (col. 8, ll. 5-9). Siefert does not teach the explicit use of different cursors that indicate different statuses of a course section with respect to a given individual. However, in related art, Holtz teaches a system and method for providing educational training via networking means (col. 1, ll. 50-54) wherein a student can access class lessons using a computer workstation and a GUI (col. 21, ll. 43-47). Holtz teaches further wherein the GUI displays lessons sections which correspond with icons or hot spots which indicate utilizing a color scheme the lessons sections that have a status with respect to progress (col. 21, line 66 – col. 22, line 14). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to enhance the PCs used by users as taught by Siefert wherein users can access course sections by implementing the GUI as taught by Holtz which includes status progress icons for view by the student. One of ordinary skill in the art at would have been motivated to make such a combination wherein it is taught by Holtz the usefulness of students being able to view a GUI wherein the learning experience is enhanced and made more user friendly where nontraditional media intensive methods are needed due to the industry becoming more complex and diverse and it is needed for teaching of students to become more standard through Internetworking means(Holtz, col. 2, ll. 2-10).

22. Regarding claim 6, Siefert and Holtz teach the control system for achieving quality ensured competence development wherein a first cursor denotes that a course section has been completed, a second cursor denotes that a course section is ongoing, and a third cursor denotes that a course section has been commenced but not yet completed (Holtz, col. 21, line 66 – col. 22, line 14).

23. Regarding claim 7, Siefert discloses the control system for achieving quality ensured competence development wherein a fourth cursor functions to start and stop the recording of the time spent on a respective course section by the recording device (Holtz, col. 21, line 66 – col. 22, line 14).

24. Regarding claim 8, Siefert and Holtz teach the control system for achieving quality ensured competence development wherein a fifth cursor enables an individual to communicate with a teacher in writing (Holtz, col. 21, ll. 14-21).

25. Regarding claim 11, Siefert teaches individuals utilizing computer devices (PCs) (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 4) and the status tracking of individual users with respect to course section progress (col. 8, ll. 5-9). Siefert does not teach the explicit use of different cursors that indicate different statuses of a course section with respect to a given individual. However, in related art, Holtz teaches a system and method for providing educational training via networking means (col. 1, ll. 50-54) wherein a student can access class lessons using a computer workstation and a GUI (col. 21, ll. 43-47). Holtz teaches further wherein the GUI displays lessons sections which correspond with icons or hot spots which indicate utilizing a color scheme the lessons sections that have a status with respect to progress (col. 21, line 66 – col. 22, line 14). One of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to enhance the PCs used by users as taught by Siefert wherein users can access course sections by implementing the GUI as taught by Holtz which includes status progress icons for view by the student. One of ordinary skill in the art at would have been motivated to make such a combination wherein it is taught by Holtz the usefulness of students being able to view a GUI wherein the learning experience is enhanced and made more user friendly where nontraditional media intensive methods are needed due to the industry becoming more complex and diverse and it is needed for teaching of students to become more standard through Internetworking means(Holtz, col. 2, ll. 2-10).

26. Regarding claim 12, Siefert and Holtz teach the method of achieving quality ensured competence development wherein the control system includes at least one recording device operable in recording the time spent by each individual on different course sections, wherein the method further comprises the step of using a fourth cursor for starting and stopping recording of the time spent on a course section by the recording device (Holtz, col. 21, line 66 – col. 22, line 14).

27. Regarding claim 13, Siefert and Holtz teach the method of achieving quality ensured competence development further comprising using a fifth cursor displayed on the display device to enable an individual to communicate with a teacher in writing (Holtz, col. 21, ll. 14-21).

28. Regarding claim 14, Siefert and Holtz teach the method of achieving quality ensured competence development wherein the distributed computer network is the

Internet or a Wide Area Network (WAN) (Siefert, Figure 1 and col. 2, ll. 15-16 and 44-47).

Response to Arguments

29. Applicant's arguments filed 19 July 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

30. (A) Applicant argues with respect to claim 1 that Siefert does not disclose (i) validation and mapping existing student competence, and (iii) certification of the student of fulfillment of requirements for the studies. Examiner respectfully disagrees. With respect to (i), Siefert teaches in column 8, lines 13-24 the utilization of a profile system wherein a level of competency of a student can be determined in a non-intrusive, transparent manner, based on a demonstration of a level of competency by the student. This aspect of Siefert's invention reads on the idea of the applicant's invention of "validation and mapping existing student competence." With respect to (iii), Siefert teaches in column 8, lines 5-9, the tracking of student progress and includes a present standing which refers to courses presently being taken and the progress made in each. This aspect of Siefert's invention reads on the idea of the applicant's invention of "certification of the student of fulfillment of requirements for the studies."

31. (B) Applicant argues further with respect to claim 1 that Siefert does not disclose the use of different memory devices for different uses in a control system that make content development and revision more efficient. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Siefert teaches on the utilization of different or multiple memory devices for different uses as illustrated in figure 1. As illustrated in figure 1 and further described in column

2, lines 42-51, a plurality of different repositories are utilized to store a plurality of different educational computer programs which are accessed by students via a network. This aspect of Siefert, specifically the utilization of different repositories, or in words computer memories, reads on the aspect of the use of different memory devices for different uses in a control system that make content development and revision more efficient. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "make content development and revision more efficient") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

32. (C) Applicant argues with respect to claims 10 and 18 that Siefert does not disclose (i) a method step in which a user access a "first memory device" to choose course selections to create an individual adapted course plan based on an individual competence and downloading study material affiliated with the chosen course section "from a second memory device." Applicant argues further that Siefert's repositories does not constitute (ii) a method or system for selecting courses and generating a course plan with one memory device, downloading course study material from a second memory device, storing a course plan in a third memory device, and tracking completed courses in a fourth memory device. Applicant argues even further that Siefert (iii) does not disclose storing the individual adapted course plan in a "third memory device." Applicant argues further that Siefert (iv) does not disclose calculating a plan completion

date for an individual adapted course plan. Applicant argues further that Siefert (v) does not disclose storing an indication in a fourth memory device that the user has completed a course action. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's arguments, specifically arguments i-v, fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. With respect to (i), Siefert teaches on a method step in which a user accesses a first memory device to choose course selections to create an individual adapted course plan based on an individual competence and downloading study material affiliated with the chosen course section from a second memory device wherein Siefert teaches the use of repositories as outlined above and in column 4, lines 38-46 wherein proper course lessons are selected and provided to a student as necessary. With respect to (ii), Siefert teaches a method for selecting courses and generating a course plan with one memory device, downloading course study material from a second memory device, storing a course plan in a third memory device and tracking completed courses in a fourth memory device wherein Siefert utilizes a plurality of repositories to store a plurality of different educational materials as outlines above and in column 4, lines 38-46 wherein proper course lessons are selected and provided to a student as necessary based on past performance. With respect to (iii), Siefert teaches the individual adapted course plan wherein Siefert teaches in column 8, lines 47-51 the access of resources and profiles to create course lessons for students is performed. With respect to (iv), Siefert teaches calculating a plan completion date for an individual

adapted course plan wherein Siefert teaches in column 3, lines 53-60 wherein a presentation of a lesson is given to a student for a limited period of time and is therefore within the scope of the filed claim. Further, Siefert teaches in column 9, lines 44-50 wherein time is logged for completion and students are expected to complete certain lessons in set periods of time. With respect to (v), Siefert teaches the storing of an indication that a user has completed a course action wherein Siefert teaches in column 9 lines 1-5 an exemplary embodiment wherein user progress is tracked with respect to how many lessons have been completed by a student. This exemplary embodiment is deemed within the scope of the applicant's claim.

33. Applicant argues with respect to the dependent claims that (i) Siefert does not disclose validating a user "before" the user takes course sections; (ii) Siefert does not disclose a test generator for randomized list; (iii) Siefert does not disclose generating test questions regarding theoretical questions and test items of practical events relating to the course sections; and (iv) Siefert does not disclose test items for practical events that are presented to the user in a chronological order in accordance with the production process or station system. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's arguments, specifically arguments i-iv, fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. With respect to (i), Siefert teaches the validation of users before the taking of course sections wherein Siefert teaches in column 9, lines 37-49 wherein a rate of learning is determined for a student and a lesson is arranged based on this calculation.

Art Unit: 2142

With respect to (ii), Siefert teaches a test generator for a randomized list in column 7, lines 17-24 wherein a learning profile is dynamically generated based on standard tests in combination with the needs of a student. As further elaborated in column 7, lines 38-43, an education plan is tailor made for a student which contains a vast array of different lessons to provide individual attention. With respect to (iii), Siefert teaches the generating test questions regarding theoretical questions and test items of practical events relating to the course sections wherein Siefert teaches in column 7, lines 38-43, an education plan is tailor made for a student which contains a vast array of different lessons to provide individual attention. With respect to (iv), Siefert teaches test items for practical events that are presented to the user in a chronological order in accordance with the production process or station system wherein Siefert teaches in column 7, lines 38-43, an education plan is tailor made for a student which contains a vast array of different lessons to provide individual attention.

34. In view of the above arguments, applicant's claims as filed are not deemed patentable over the cited prior art of record.

Conclusion

35. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

36. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sofer et al. (US 6,920,487 B2) teaches a system and method for global access to services for mobile telephone subscribers.

Packard et al. (US 2007/0184427 A1) teaches a system and method for virtual schooling.

Hersh (US 7,207,804 B2) teaches an application of multi-media technology to computer administered vocational personnel assessment.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached as follows: First week: Monday (5:30am-

Art Unit: 2142

10:00am; 5:00pm-8:30pm), Tuesday (1:00pm-8:00pm), Wednesday (5:30am-8:30am; 1:00pm-8:00pm), Thursday (1:00pm-8:00pm). Second Week: Tuesday (1:00pm-8:00pm), Wednesday (5:30am-8:30am; 1:00pm-8:00pm), Thursday (1:00pm-8:00pm), Friday (5:30am-10:00am). The examiner teleworks every First Friday and Second Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

baa


ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER